

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action dated March 13, 2008. Claims 105, 106, 107, 110, 112, and 117 have been amended and claims 1 - 104 , 108, 109, 111, and 113 - 116 have been canceled. New claim 118 is provided. Applicant submits that all of the claims in the case are now in condition for allowance. Such action is therefore respectfully requested at an early date.

As the Examiner will recall, the present invention is directed to a tube for the manufacture of an inflated bag of air, i.e. air bag. The air bags of the present invention are typically used as a packaging material to protect an item within a box during shipment of the item. An uninflated tube of the present invention is configured to be gathered, i.e. bunched up, along a support member prior to manufacture of the air bag. To manufacture an air bag, air is introduced into the tube and open ends of the tube are sealed by heat sealing. The tube is formed of a thermoplastic film and thus is heat sealable and retains air.

Claims 105-107 and 109-117 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly independent claim 105 has been amended such that the term "cartridge" has been replaced with the term "tube of film."

Claims 105-107 and 109-117 stand rejected as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5755457 to Specht.

The Specht reference discloses a fabric material for use in vehicle airbags designed to deploy in the event of a crash to prevent injury to occupants of the vehicle. The Specht reference makes repeated references to fabric (Column 4 lines 10, 18, and 45). It is an essential property of vehicle crash air bags that they are inflated rapidly by an explosion and of necessity must be porous in order that they can collapse and absorb the impact of part of the body. Air bags for use in vehicle crashes expand and then collapse in less than a second.

The Specht reference does not teach, suggest, or show a tube of film that is heat sealable as required by independent claim 105. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 105 is now in condition for allowance for the foregoing reasons. Because claims 106, 107, 110, 112, and 117 have been amended, Applicant respectfully submits that they too are in condition for allowance. New claim 118 properly depends directly or indirectly from patentable base claim 105 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons thereof.

If the Examiner believes that any issue remains for discussion, he is invited to contact the undersigned.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or any underpayments which may be required for the above-referenced application to Deposit Account No. 01-0265.

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin R. Nifong/
Justin R. Nifong
Attorney for Applicant

Appl. No. 10/542,267
Amendment dated June 9, 2008
Response to Office Action dated March 13, 2008

Reg. No. 59,389

Justin R. Nifong
Adams Intellectual Property Law, P.A.
Suite 2350 Charlotte Plaza
201 South College Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28244
Tel: (704) 375-9249
Fax: (704) 375-0729
Email: wta@adamspat.com
File No. : 0148/408US